

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants thank the Examiner for his Office Action mailed February 11, 2005. **Claims 9-20** have been allowed. **Claims 1, 3, and 4** have been rejected. **Claims 2 & 5-8** are objected to. These rejected and objected to claims are discussed in detail hereinbelow. **Claims 21, 22, 23, & 24** have been added to more clearly capture certain allowable subject matter. Thus, **Claims 1-24** are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby requested.

New Claims

Claims 2 and 5-8 were objected to as depending on rejected base claims. However, such claims were deemed allowable if appropriately amended. Accordingly, these claims were recast in independent form as new **Claims 21-24**. **Claim 21** captures the subject matter of **Claims 1 and 2**. **Claim 22** captures the subject matter of **Claims 1, 4, 5, and 6**. **Claim 23** captures the subject matter of **Claims 1 and 7**. **Claim 24** captures the subject matter of **Claims 1, 7, and 8**. Accordingly, these new claims should be allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, and 4:

Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gross* (USPN 5,206,181)(hereinafter *Gross*), in view of *McClure* (USPN 5,557,573) (hereinafter *McClure*). In particular, *McClure* is cited for the proposition that it teaches (at col. 7: lines 3-39) “monitoring the output of an identification cell located within the first of the plurality of integrated circuit dies by using the test fixture to provide contact with contacts on the wafer corresponding to the identification cell”. The applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation of the cited portions of *McClure*. *McClure* teaches a memory circuit 110 and a method for accessing a memory circuit that establishes “special test operation modes” and to establish predetermined logic states (*McClure* 7:30-35). The cited *McClure* circuitry does not teach or even suggest monitoring an “identification cell” or providing contacts to enabling such monitoring as required by the claims. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited art simply does not teach all of the limitations of the present invention. Consequently, the cited references fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to at least rejected Claim 1.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

For at least this reason, the cited combination of references has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to dependent Claims 3 and 4 (all of which depend from Claim 1).

Claim Objections:

Claims 2 and 5-8 are objected to as depending on rejected base claims. For at least the reasons raised above with respect to Claim 1, the cited combination of references has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to dependent Claims 2 and 5-8 (all of which depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 1). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

Alternatively, the applicants further submit that added Claims 21-24 fully capture the objected to subject matter while incorporated the intervening claims.


Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention as presently presented is patentable over the art of record and that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner, for any reason, wish to contact the undersigned, he is cordially invited to do so at his convenience. Moreover, if the Examiner has any continuing concerns regarding this case, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (650) 961-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Francis T. Kalinski II
Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (650) 961-8300